

# THE MORDELL-LANG THEOREM FOR FINITELY GENERATED SUBGROUPS OF A SEMIABELIAN VARIETY DEFINED OVER A FINITE FIELD

DRAGOS GHIOCA

**ABSTRACT.** We determine the structure of the intersection of a finitely generated subgroup of a semiabelian variety  $G$  defined over a finite field with a closed subvariety  $X \subset G$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $G$  be a semiabelian variety defined over a finite field  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . Let  $K$  be a regular field extension of  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . Let  $F$  be the corresponding Frobenius for  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . Then  $F \in \text{End}(G)$ .

Let  $X$  be a subvariety of  $G$  defined over  $K$  (in this paper, all subvarieties will be closed). In [3] and [4], Moosa and Scanlon discussed the intersection of the  $K$ -points of  $X$  with a finitely generated  $\mathbb{Z}[F]$ -submodule  $\Gamma$  of  $G(K)$ . They proved that the intersection is a finite union of  $F$ -sets in  $\Gamma$  (see Definition 2.4). Our goal is to extend their result to the case when  $\Gamma$  is a finitely generated subgroup of  $G(K)$  (not necessarily invariant under  $F$ ).

In Section 2 we will state our main results, which include, besides the Mordell-Lang statement for subgroups of semiabelian varieties defined over finite fields, also a similar Mordell-Lang statement for Drinfeld modules defined over finite fields. The Mordell-Lang Theorem for Drinfeld modules was also studied by the author in [1]. In Section 3 we will prove our main theorem for semiabelian varieties, while in Section 4 we will show how the Mordell-Lang statement for Drinfeld modules defined over finite fields can be deduced from the results in [3]. We will conclude Section 4 with two counterexamples for two possible extensions of our statement for Drinfeld modules towards results similar with the ones true for semiabelian varieties.

## 2. STATEMENT OF OUR MAIN RESULTS

Everywhere in this paper,  $\overline{Y}$  represents the Zariski closure of the set  $Y$ .

A central notion for the present paper is the notion of a *Frobenius ring*. This notion was first introduced by Moosa and Scanlon (see Definition 2.1 in [4]). We extend their definition to include also rings of finite characteristic.

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $R$  be a Dedekind domain with the property that for every nonzero prime ideal  $\mathfrak{p} \subset R$ ,  $R/\mathfrak{p}$  is a finite field. We call  $R[F]$  a Frobenius ring if the following properties are satisfied:

- (i)  $R[F]$  is a simple extension of  $R$  generated by a distinguished element  $F$ .
- (ii)  $R[F]$  is a finite integral extension of  $R$ .
- (iii)  $F$  is not a zero divisor in  $R[F]$ .
- (iv) The ideal  $F^\infty R[F] := \bigcap_{n \geq 0} F^n R[F]$  is trivial.

---

<sup>1</sup>2000 AMS Subject Classification: Primary 11G10; Secondary 11G09, 11G25

The classical example of a Frobenius ring associated to a semiabelian variety  $G$  defined over the finite field  $\mathbb{F}_q$  is  $\mathbb{Z}[F]$ , where  $F$  is the corresponding Frobenius for  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . This Frobenius ring is discussed in [3] and [4]. We will show later in this section that  $A[F]$  is also a Frobenius ring when  $F$  is the Frobenius on  $\mathbb{F}_q$  and  $\phi : A \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q[F]$  is a Drinfeld module (in this case,  $A$  is a Dedekind domain of finite characteristic).

We define the notion of *groupless  $F$ -sets* contained in a module over a Frobenius ring.

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $R[F]$  be a Frobenius ring and let  $M$  be an  $R[F]$ -module. For  $a \in M$  and  $\delta \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , we denote the  $F^\delta$ -orbit of  $a$  by  $S(a; \delta) := \{F^{\delta n}a \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . If  $a_1, \dots, a_k \in M$  and  $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , then we denote the sum of the  $F^{\delta_i}$ -orbits of  $a_i$  by

$$S(a_1, \dots, a_k; \delta_1, \dots, \delta_k) = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k F^{\delta_i n_i} a_i \mid (n_1, \dots, n_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k \right\}.$$

A set of the form  $b + S(a_1, \dots, a_k; \delta_1, \dots, \delta_k)$  with  $b, a_1, \dots, a_k \in M$  is called a groupless  $F$ -set based in  $M$ . We do allow in our definition of groupless  $F$ -sets  $k = 0$ , in which case, the groupless  $F$ -set consists of the single point  $b$ . We denote by  $\text{GF}_M$  the set of all groupless  $F$ -sets based in  $M$ . For every subgroup  $\Gamma \subset M$ , we denote by  $\text{GF}_M(\Gamma)$  the collection of groupless  $F$ -sets contained in  $\Gamma$  and based in  $M$ . When  $M$  is clear from the context, we will drop the index  $M$  from our notation.

*Remark 2.3.* Each groupless  $F$ -set  $O$  is based in a finitely generated  $\mathbb{Z}[F]$ -module.

**Definition 2.4.** Let  $M$  be a module over a Frobenius ring  $R[F]$ . Let  $\Gamma \subset M$  be a subgroup. A set of the form  $(C + H)$ , where  $C \in \text{GF}_M(\Gamma)$  and  $H$  is a subgroup of  $\Gamma$  invariant under  $F$  is called an  $F$ -set in  $\Gamma$  based in  $M$ . The collection of all such  $F$ -sets in  $\Gamma$  is denoted by  $\text{F}_M(\Gamma)$ . When  $M$  is clear from the context, we will drop the index  $M$  from our notation.

Let  $G$  be a semiabelian variety defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . Let  $F$  be the corresponding Frobenius for  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . Let  $K$  be a finitely generated regular extension of  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . We fix an algebraic closure  $K^{\text{alg}}$  of  $K$ . Let  $\Gamma$  be a finitely generated subgroup of  $G(K)$ . We denote by  $\text{F}(\Gamma)$  and  $\text{GF}(\Gamma)$  the collection of  $F$ -sets and respectively, the collection of groupless  $F$ -sets in  $\Gamma$  based in  $G(K^{\text{alg}})$  (which is obviously a  $\mathbb{Z}[F]$ -module). When we do not mention the  $\mathbb{Z}[F]$ -submodule containing the base points for the  $F$ -sets contained in  $\Gamma$ , then we will always understand that the corresponding submodule is  $G(K^{\text{alg}})$ . The following theorem is our main result for semiabelian varieties.

**Theorem 2.5.** *Let  $G$ ,  $K$  and  $\Gamma$  be as in the above paragraph. Let  $X$  be a  $K$ -subvariety of  $G$ . Then  $X(K) \cap \Gamma = \bigcup_{i=1}^r (C_i + H_i)$ , where  $(C_i + \Delta_i) \in \text{F}(\Gamma)$ . Moreover, the subgroups  $\Delta_i$  from  $X(K) \cap \Gamma$  are of the form  $G_i(K) \cap \Gamma$ , where  $G_i$  is an algebraic subgroup of  $G$  defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ .*

As mentioned in Section 1, the result of our Theorem 2.5 was established in [3] (see Theorem 7.8) and in [4] (see Theorem 2.1) for finitely generated  $\mathbb{Z}[F]$ -modules  $\Gamma \subset G(K)$ . Because  $\mathbb{Z}[F]$  is a finite extension of  $\mathbb{Z}$ , each finitely generated  $\mathbb{Z}[F]$ -module is also a finitely generated group (but *not* every finitely generated group is invariant under  $F$ ).

We describe now the setting for our Drinfeld modules statements. We start by defining Drinfeld modules over finite fields.

Let  $p$  be a prime number and let  $q$  be a power of  $p$ . Let  $C$  be a projective nonsingular curve defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . We fix a closed point  $\infty$  on  $C$ . Let  $A$  be the ring of  $\mathbb{F}_q$ -valued functions on

$C$ , regular away from  $\infty$ . Then  $A$  is a Dedekind domain. Moreover,  $A$  is a finite extension of  $\mathbb{F}_q[t]$ . Hence, for every nonzero prime ideal  $\mathfrak{p} \subset A$ ,  $A/\mathfrak{p}$  is a finite field.

Let  $F$  be the corresponding Frobenius on  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . We call a Drinfeld module defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  a ring homomorphism  $\phi : A \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q[F]$  such that there exists  $a \in A$  for which  $\phi_a := \phi(a) \notin \mathbb{F}_q \cdot F^0$  (i.e. the degree of  $\phi_a$  as a polynomial in  $F$  is positive). In general, for every  $a \in A$ , we write  $\phi_a$  to denote  $\phi(a) \in \mathbb{F}_q[F]$ . We note that this is not the most general definition for Drinfeld modules defined over finite fields (see Example 4.8).

For each field extension  $L$  of  $\mathbb{F}_q$ ,  $\phi$  induces an action on  $\mathbb{G}_a(L)$  by  $a * x := \phi_a(x)$  for every  $x \in L$  and for every  $a \in A$ . For each  $g \geq 1$ , we extend the action of  $A$  diagonally on  $\mathbb{G}_a^g$ .

Clearly, for every  $a \in A$ ,  $F\phi_a = \phi_a F$ . This means  $F$  is an *endomorphism* of  $\phi$  (see Section 4 of Chapter 2 in [2]). We let  $A[F] \in \text{End}(\phi)$  be the finite extension of  $A$  generated by  $F$ , where we identified  $A$  with its image in  $\mathbb{F}_q[F]$  through  $\phi$ . Actually,  $A[F]$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{F}_q[F]$ . However, we keep the notation  $A[F]$  instead of  $\mathbb{F}_q[F]$ , when we talk about modules over this ring only to emphasize the Drinfeld module action given by  $A$ .

**Lemma 2.6.** *The ring  $A[F]$  defined in the above paragraph is a Frobenius ring.*

*Proof.* Because for some  $a \in A$ ,  $\phi_a$  is a polynomial in  $F$  of positive degree, we conclude  $F$  is integral over  $A$ . Because  $\mathbb{F}_q[F]$  is a domain, we conclude  $F$  is not a zero divisor. Also, no nonzero element of  $A[F]$  is infinitely divisible by  $F$  because all elements of  $A[F]$  are polynomials in  $F$  and so, no nonzero polynomial can be infinitely divisible by some polynomial of positive degree. Therefore  $A[F]$  is a Frobenius ring.  $\square$

Let  $K$  be a regular field extension of  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . We fix an algebraic closure  $K^{\text{alg}}$  of  $K$ . Let  $\Gamma$  be a finitely generated  $A[F]$ -submodule of  $\mathbb{G}_a^g(K)$ . We denote by  $\mathsf{F}(\Gamma)$  and  $\mathsf{GF}(\Gamma)$  the  $F$ -sets and respectively, the groupless  $F$ -sets in  $\Gamma$  based in  $\mathbb{G}_a^g(K^{\text{alg}})$ . When we do not mention the  $A[F]$ -submodule containing the base points for the  $F$ -sets contained in  $\Gamma$ , we will always understand that the corresponding submodule is  $\mathbb{G}_a^g(K^{\text{alg}})$ . We will explain in Section 4 that the following Mordell-Lang statement for Drinfeld modules defined over finite fields follows along the same lines as Theorem 7.8 in [3].

**Theorem 2.7.** *Let  $\phi : A \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q[F]$  be a Drinfeld module. Let  $K$  be a regular extension of  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . Let  $g$  be a positive integer. Let  $\Gamma$  be a finitely generated  $A[F]$ -submodule of  $\mathbb{G}_a^g(K)$  and let  $X$  be an affine subvariety of  $\mathbb{G}_a^g$  defined over  $K$ . Then  $X(K) \cap \Gamma$  is a finite union of  $F$ -sets in  $\Gamma$ .*

### 3. THE MORDELL-LANG THEOREM FOR SEMIABELIAN VARIETIES DEFINED OVER FINITE FIELDS

*Proof of Theorem 2.5.* We first observe that the subgroups  $\Delta_i$  from the intersection of  $X$  with  $\Gamma$  are indeed of the form  $G_i(K) \cap \Gamma$  for algebraic groups  $G_i$  defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . Otherwise, we can always replace a subgroup  $\Delta_i$  appearing in the intersection  $X(K) \cap \Gamma$  with its Zariski closure  $G_i$  and then intersect with  $\Gamma$  (see also the proof of Lemma 7.4 in [3]). Because  $G_i$  is the Zariski closure of a subset of  $G(K)$ , then  $G_i$  is defined over  $K$ . Because  $G_i$  is an algebraic subgroup of  $G$ , then  $G_i$  is defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q^{\text{alg}}$ . Because  $K$  is a regular extension of  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , we conclude that  $G_i$  is defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q = K \cap \mathbb{F}_q^{\text{alg}}$ .

We will prove the main statement of Theorem 2.5 by induction on  $\dim(X)$ . Clearly, when  $\dim(X) = 0$  the statement holds (the intersection is a finite collection of points in that case). Assume the statement holds for  $\dim(X) < d$  and we prove that it holds also for  $\dim(X) = d$ .

We will use in our proof a number of reduction steps.

*Step 1.* Because  $X(K) \cap \Gamma = \overline{X(K) \cap \Gamma} \cap \Gamma$  we may assume that  $X(K) \cap \Gamma$  is Zariski dense in  $X$ .

*Step 2.* At the expense of replacing  $X$  by one of its irreducible components, we may assume  $X$  is irreducible. Each irreducible component of  $X$  has Zariski dense intersection with  $\Gamma$ . If our Theorem 2.5 holds for each irreducible component of  $X$ , then it also holds for  $X$ .

*Step 3.* We may assume the stabilizer  $\text{Stab}_G(X)$  of  $X$  in  $G$  is finite. Indeed, let  $H := \text{Stab}_G(X)$ . Then  $H$  is defined over  $K$  (because  $X$  is defined over  $K$ ) and also,  $H$  is defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q^{\text{alg}}$  (because it is an algebraic subgroup of  $G$ ). Thus  $H$  is defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . Let  $\pi : G \rightarrow G/H$  be the natural projection. Let  $\hat{G}$ ,  $\hat{X}$  and  $\hat{\Gamma}$  be the images of  $G$ ,  $X$  and  $\Gamma$  through  $\pi$ . Clearly  $\hat{\Gamma}$  is a finitely generated subgroup of  $\hat{G}(K)$  and also,  $\hat{X}$  is defined over  $K$ .

If  $\dim(H) > 0$ , then  $\dim(\hat{X}) < \dim(X) = d$ . Hence, by the inductive hypothesis,  $\hat{X}(K) \cap \hat{\Gamma}$  is a finite union of  $F$ -sets in  $\hat{\Gamma}$ . Using the fact that the kernel of  $\pi|_{\Gamma}$  stabilizes  $X(K) \cap \Gamma$ , we conclude

$$X(K) \cap \Gamma = \pi|_{\Gamma}^{-1} (\hat{X}(K) \cap \hat{\Gamma}),$$

which shows that  $X(K) \cap \Gamma$  is also a finite union of  $F$ -sets, because  $\ker(\pi|_{\Gamma})$  is a subgroup of  $\Gamma$  invariant under  $F$  (we recall that  $\ker(\pi) = H$  is invariant under  $F$ ).

Therefore, we work from now on under the assumptions that

- (i)  $\overline{X(K) \cap \Gamma} = X$ ;
- (ii)  $X$  is irreducible;
- (iii)  $\text{Stab}_G(X)$  is finite.

Let  $\tilde{\Gamma}$  be the  $\mathbb{Z}[F]$ -module generated by  $\Gamma$ . Because  $\Gamma$  is finitely generated and  $F$  is integral over  $\mathbb{Z}$ , then also  $\tilde{\Gamma}$  is finitely generated. By Theorem 7.8 of [3],  $X(K) \cap \tilde{\Gamma}$  is a finite union of  $F$ -sets in  $\tilde{\Gamma}$ . So, there are finitely many groupless  $F$ -sets  $C_i$  and  $\mathbb{Z}[F]$ -submodules  $H_i \subset \tilde{\Gamma}$  such that

$$X(K) \cap \tilde{\Gamma} = \bigcup_i (C_i + H_i).$$

We want to show  $\bigcup_i (C_i + H_i) \cap \Gamma$  is a finite union of  $F$ -sets in  $\Gamma$ . It suffices to show that for each  $i$ , there exists a finite union  $B_i$  of  $F$ -sets in  $\Gamma$  such that  $(C_i + H_i) \cap \Gamma \subset B_i \subset X(K)$ . Indeed, the existence of such  $B_i$  yields

$$X(K) \cap \Gamma = \bigcup_i B_i,$$

as desired.

*Case 1.*  $\dim \overline{C_i + H_i} < d$ .

Let  $X_i := \overline{C_i + H_i}$ . Then  $X_i$  is defined over  $K$  (because  $(C_i + H_i) \subset G(K)$ ) and  $\dim(X_i) < d$ . So, by the induction hypothesis,  $B_i := X_i(K) \cap \Gamma$  is a finite union of  $F$ -sets in  $\Gamma$ . Clearly,  $(C_i + H_i) \cap \Gamma \subset B_i \subset X(K)$  (because  $X_i \subset X$ ).

*Case 2.*  $\dim \overline{C_i + H_i} = d$ .

Because  $X = \overline{X(K) \cap \Gamma}$ , then  $X = \overline{X(K) \cap \tilde{\Gamma}}$ . Moreover,  $X$  is irreducible and so, because  $\dim \overline{C_i + H_i} = \dim(X)$ , then  $X = \overline{C_i + H_i}$ . Hence  $H_i \subset \text{Stab}_G(X)$  because

$$C_i + H_i + H_i = C_i + H_i \text{ and so, } \overline{C_i + H_i} + H_i \subset \overline{C_i + H_i}.$$

Because  $\text{Stab}_G(X)$  is finite, we conclude  $H_i$  is finite. Thus  $(C_i + H_i)$  is a finite union of groupless  $F$ -sets because it can be written as a finite union  $\cup_{h \in H_i} (h + C_i)$ . We let  $B_i := (C_i + H_i) \cap \Gamma$ . We will show that for each (of the finitely many elements)  $h \in H_i$ ,

$$(1) \quad (h + C_i) \cap \Gamma \text{ is a finite union of groupless } F\text{-sets in } \Gamma.$$

The following lemma will prove (1) and so, it will conclude the proof of Theorem 2.5.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $M$  be a finitely generated  $\mathbb{Z}[F]$ -submodule of  $G(K^{\text{alg}})$  and let  $O \in \mathsf{GF}_M$ . If  $\Gamma$  is a finitely generated subgroup of  $G(K^{\text{alg}})$ , then  $O \cap \Gamma$  is a finite union of groupless  $F$ -sets based in  $M$ .*

*Proof.* If  $O \cap \Gamma$  is finite, then we are done. So, from now on, we may assume  $O \cap \Gamma$  is infinite. Also, we may and do assume  $\Gamma \subset M$  (otherwise we replace  $\Gamma$  with  $\Gamma \cap M$ ).

Let  $O := Q + S(P_1, \dots, P_k; \delta_1, \dots, \delta_k)$ , where  $Q, P_1, \dots, P_k \in M$  and  $\delta_i \in \mathbb{N}^*$  for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . We may assume that  $\delta_1 = \dots = \delta_k = 1$ , in which case  $S(P_1, \dots, P_k; \delta_1, \dots, \delta_k) := S(P_1, \dots, P_k; 1)$ . Indeed, if we show that

$$(Q + S(P_1, \dots, P_k; 1)) \cap \Gamma \text{ is a union of groupless } F\text{-sets,}$$

then also its subsequent intersection with  $(Q + S(P_1, \dots, P_k; \delta_1, \dots, \delta_k))$  is a finite union of groupless  $F$ -sets, as shown in part (a) of Lemma 3.7 in [3].

Because  $M$  is a finitely generated  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module,  $M$  is isomorphic with a direct sum of its finite torsion  $M_{\text{tor}}$  and a free  $\mathbb{Z}$ -submodule  $M_1$ .

Let

$$(2) \quad f(X) := X^g - \sum_{i=0}^{g-1} \alpha_i X^i$$

be the minimal polynomial for  $F$  over  $\mathbb{Z}$  (i.e.  $f(F) = 0$  in  $\text{End}(G)$ ). Let  $r_1, \dots, r_g$  be all the roots in  $\mathbb{C}$  of  $f(X)$ . Clearly, each  $r_i \neq 0$  because  $F$  is not a zero-divisor in  $\text{End}(G)$ . Also, each  $r_i$  has absolute value larger than 1 (actually, their absolute values equal  $q$  or  $q^{\frac{1}{2}}$ , according to the Riemann hypothesis for semiabelian varieties defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ ). Finally, all  $r_i$  are distinct. At most one of the  $r_i$  is real and it equals  $q$  (and it corresponds to the multiplicative part of  $G$ ), while all of the other  $r_i$  have absolute value equal to  $q^{\frac{1}{2}}$  (and they correspond to the abelian part of  $G$ ). If

$$0 \rightarrow T \rightarrow G \rightarrow A \rightarrow 0$$

is a short exact sequence of group varieties, with  $T$  being a torus and  $A$  an abelian variety, then the roots  $r_i$  of absolute value  $q^{\frac{1}{2}}$  correspond to roots of the minimal polynomial over  $\mathbb{Z}$  for the Frobenius morphism on  $A$ . The abelian variety  $A$  is isogenous with a product of simple abelian varieties  $A_i$ , all defined over a finite field. If  $f_i$  is the minimal polynomial of the corresponding Frobenius on  $A_i$ , then the minimal polynomial  $f_0$  of the Frobenius on  $A$  is the least common multiple of all  $f_i$ . For each  $i$ ,  $\text{End}(A_i)$  is a domain and so,  $f_i$  has simple roots. Therefore  $f_0$  (and so,  $f$ ) has simple roots.

The definition of  $f$  shows that for every point  $P \in G(K^{\text{alg}})$ ,

$$(3) \quad F^g P = \sum_{j=0}^{g-1} \alpha_j F^j P.$$

5

We conclude that for all  $n \geq g$ ,

$$(4) \quad F^n P = \sum_{j=0}^{g-1} \alpha_j F^{n-g+j} P.$$

For each  $j$  we define the sequence  $\{z_{j,n}\}_{n \geq 0}$  as follows

$$(5) \quad z_{j,n} = 0 \text{ if } 0 \leq n \leq g-1 \text{ and } n \neq j;$$

$$(6) \quad z_{j,j} = 1 \text{ and}$$

$$(7) \quad z_{j,n} = \sum_{l=0}^{g-1} \alpha_l z_{j,n-g+l} \text{ for all } n \geq g.$$

Using (5) and (6) we obtain that

$$(8) \quad F^n P = \sum_{j=0}^{g-1} z_{j,n} F^j P, \text{ for every } 0 \leq n \leq g-1.$$

We prove by induction on  $n$  that

$$(9) \quad F^n P = \sum_{j=0}^{g-1} z_{j,n} F^j P, \text{ for every } n \geq 0.$$

We already know (9) is valid for all  $n \leq g-1$  due to (8). Thus we assume (9) holds for all  $n < N$ , where  $N \geq g$  and we prove that (9) also holds for  $n = N$ . Using (4), we get

$$(10) \quad F^N P = \sum_{j=0}^{g-1} \alpha_j F^{N-g+j}.$$

We apply the induction hypothesis to all  $F^{N-g+j}$  for  $0 \leq j \leq g-1$  and conclude

$$(11) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{g-1} \alpha_j F^{N-g+j} = \sum_{j=0}^{g-1} \alpha_j \sum_{i=0}^{g-1} z_{i,N-g+j} F^i P = \sum_{i=0}^{g-1} \left( \sum_{j=0}^{g-1} \alpha_j z_{i,N-g+j} \right) F^i P.$$

We use (7) in (11) and conclude

$$(12) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{g-1} \alpha_j F^{N-g+j} = \sum_{i=0}^{g-1} z_{i,N} F^i P.$$

Combining (10) and (12) we obtain the statement of (9) for  $n = N$ . This concludes the inductive proof of (9).

Because  $\{z_{j,n}\}_n$  is a recursive defined sequence, then for each  $j \in \{0, \dots, g-1\}$  there exist  $\{\gamma_{j,l}\}_{1 \leq l \leq g} \subset \mathbb{Q}^{\text{alg}}$  such that for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$(13) \quad z_{j,n} = \sum_{1 \leq l \leq g} \gamma_{j,l} r_l^n.$$

To derive (13) we also use the fact that all  $r_i$  are distinct, nonzero numbers.

Equations (9) and (13) show that for every  $n$  and for every  $P \in G(K^{\text{alg}})$ ,

$$(14) \quad F^n P = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq g-1} \left( \sum_{1 \leq l \leq g} \gamma_{j,l} r_l^n \right) F^j P.$$

For each  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  and for each  $j \in \{0, \dots, g-1\}$ , let  $F^j P_i := T_i^{(j)} + Q_i^{(j)}$ , with  $T_i^{(j)} \in M_{\text{tor}}$  and  $Q_i^{(j)} \in M_1$ . Also, let  $Q := T_0 + Q_0$ , where  $T_0 \in M_{\text{tor}}$  and  $Q_0 \in M_1$ .

Let  $R_1, \dots, R_m$  be a basis for the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $M_1$ . For each  $j \in \{0, \dots, g-1\}$  and for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , let

$$(15) \quad Q_i^{(j)} := \sum_{l=1}^m a_{i,j}^{(l)} R_l,$$

where  $a_{i,j}^{(l)} \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Finally, let  $a_0^{(1)}, \dots, a_0^{(m)} \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $Q_0 = \sum_{j=1}^m a_0^{(j)} R_j$ .

For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , (9) and the definitions of  $Q_i^{(j)}$  and  $T_i^{(j)}$  yield

$$(16) \quad F^n P_i = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq g-1} z_{j,n} \left( T_i^{(j)} + Q_i^{(j)} \right) = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq g-1} z_{j,n} T_i^{(j)} + \sum_{0 \leq j \leq g-1} z_{j,n} Q_i^{(j)}.$$

Because  $T_i^{(j)} \in M_{\text{tor}}$ , then for each  $(n_1, \dots, n_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k$ ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=0}^{g-1} z_{j,n_i} T_i^{(j)} \in M_{\text{tor}}.$$

Also, because  $Q_0$  and all  $Q_i^{(j)}$  are in  $M_1$  and because  $z_{j,n} \in \mathbb{Z}$ , then for each  $(n_1, \dots, n_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k$ ,

$$Q_0 + \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=0}^{g-1} z_{j,n_i} Q_i^{(j)} \in M_1.$$

Moreover,

$$(17) \quad Q + \sum_{i=1}^k F^{n_i} P_i = \left( T_0 + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq k \\ 0 \leq j \leq g-1}} z_{j,n_i} T_i^{(j)} \right) + \left( Q_0 + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq k \\ 0 \leq j \leq g-1}} z_{j,n_i} Q_i^{(j)} \right).$$

For each  $h \in M_{\text{tor}}$ , if  $(h + M_1) \cap \Gamma$  is not empty, we fix  $(h + U_h) \in \Gamma$  for some  $U_h \in M_1$ . Let  $\Gamma_1 := \Gamma \cap M_1$ . Then

$$(18) \quad (h + M_1) \cap \Gamma = h + U_h + \Gamma_1.$$

For each  $h \in M_{\text{tor}}$ , we let  $O_h := \{P \in O \mid P = h + P' \text{ with } P' \in M_1\}$ . Then using (18), we get

$$(19) \quad O \cap \Gamma = \bigcup_{h \in M_{\text{tor}}} O_h \cap (h + U_h + \Gamma_1) = \bigcup_{h \in M_{\text{tor}}} (h + ((-h + O_h) \cap (U_h + \Gamma_1))).$$

Clearly,  $(-h + O_h) \in M_1$ . Therefore (19) and (17) yield

$$(20) \quad O \cap \Gamma = \bigcup_{\substack{h \in M_{\text{tor}} \\ T_0 + \sum_{i,j} z_{j,n_i} T_i^{(j)} = h}} \left( h + \left( \left( Q_0 + \sum_{i,j} z_{j,n_i} Q_i^{(j)} \right) \cap (U_h + \Gamma_1) \right) \right).$$

In (20), the union is over the finitely many torsion points of  $M_{\text{tor}}$  ( $M$  is finitely generated) and it might be that not for each  $h \in M_{\text{tor}}$  there is a corresponding nonempty intersection in (20).

Fix  $h \in M_{\text{tor}}$ . We show that the set of tuples  $(n_1, \dots, n_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k$  for which

$$(21) \quad h = T_0 + \sum_{i,j} z_{j,n_i} T_i^{(j)}$$

is a finite union of cosets of *semigroups* of  $\mathbb{N}^k$  (a semigroup of  $\mathbb{N}^k$  is the intersection of a subgroup of  $\mathbb{Z}^k$  with  $\mathbb{N}^k$ ). Indeed, let  $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$  such that  $M_{\text{tor}} \subset G[N]$ . Because for each  $j \in \{0, \dots, g-1\}$ ,  $z_{j,n}$  is a recursively defined sequence (as shown by (5), (6) and (7)), then the sequence  $\{z_{j,n}\}_n$  is eventually periodic modulo  $N$  (a recursively defined sequence is eventually periodic modulo any integral modulus). Thus each value taken by  $T_0 + \sum_{i,j} z_{j,n_i} T_i^{(j)}$  is attained for tuples  $(n_1, \dots, n_k)$  which belong to a finite union of cosets of semigroups of  $\mathbb{N}^k$ .

We will prove next that for each fixed  $h \in M_{\text{tor}}$ , the tuples  $(n_1, \dots, n_k)$  for which

$$(22) \quad \left( Q_0 + \sum_{i,j} z_{j,n_i} Q_i^{(j)} \right) \in (U_h + \Gamma_1)$$

form a finite union of cosets of semigroups of  $\mathbb{N}^k$ . This will finish the proof of our theorem because this result, combined with the one from the previous paragraph and combined with (20), will show that the tuples  $(n_1, \dots, n_k)$  for which

$$Q + \sum_{i=1}^k F^{n_i} P_i \in \Gamma$$

form a finite union of cosets of semigroups of  $\mathbb{N}^k$  (we are also using the fact that the intersection of two finite unions of cosets of semigroups is also a finite union of cosets of semigroups). Lemma 3.4 of [3] shows that the set of points in  $O$  corresponding to a finite union of cosets of semigroups containing the tuples of exponents  $(n_1, \dots, n_k)$  is a finite union of groupless  $F$ -sets.

Because  $\Gamma_1 \subset M_1$  and  $M_1$  is a free  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module with basis  $\{R_1, \dots, R_m\}$ , we can find (after a possible relabelling of  $R_1, \dots, R_m$ ) a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis  $V_1, \dots, V_n$  ( $n \leq m$ ) of  $\Gamma_1$  of the following form:

$$V_1 = \beta_1^{(i_1)} R_{i_1} + \dots + \beta_1^{(m)} R_m;$$

$$V_2 = \beta_2^{(i_2)} R_{i_2} + \dots + \beta_2^{(m)} R_m;$$

and in general,  $V_j = \beta_j^{(i_j)} R_{i_j} + \dots + \beta_j^{(m)} R_m$ , where

$$1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_n \leq m$$

and all  $\beta_j^{(i)} \in \mathbb{Z}$ . We also assume  $\beta_j^{(i_j)} \neq 0$  for every  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  ( $n \geq 1$  because we assumed the intersection  $O \cap \Gamma$  is infinite, which means  $\Gamma_1$  is infinite, because otherwise  $|O \cap \Gamma| \leq |M_{\text{tor}}|$ ).

Let  $b_0^{(1)}, \dots, b_0^{(m)} \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $U_h = \sum_{j=1}^m b_0^{(j)} R_j$ . Then a point

$$P := \sum_{j=1}^m c^{(j)} R_j \in (U_h + \Gamma_1)$$

if and only if there exist integers  $k_1, \dots, k_n$  such that

$$(23) \quad P = U_h + \sum_{i=1}^n k_i V_i.$$

Using the expressions of the  $V_i$ ,  $U_h$  and  $P$  in terms of the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis  $\{R_1, \dots, R_m\}$  of  $M_1$ , we obtain the following relations:

$$(24) \quad c^{(j)} = b_0^{(j)} \text{ for every } 1 \leq j < i_1;$$

$$(25) \quad c^{(j)} = b_0^{(j)} + k_1 \beta_1^{(j)} \text{ for every } i_1 \leq j < i_2;$$

$$(26) \quad c^{(j)} = b_0^{(j)} + k_1 \beta_1^{(j)} + k_2 \beta_2^{(j)} \text{ for every } i_2 \leq j < i_3$$

and so on, until

$$(27) \quad c^{(m)} = b_0^{(m)} + \sum_{i=1}^n k_i \beta_i^{(m)}.$$

We express equation (25) for  $j = i_1$  as a linear congruence modulo  $\beta_1^{(i_1)}$  and obtain

$$(28) \quad c^{(i_1)} \equiv b_0^{(i_1)} \pmod{\beta_1^{(i_1)}}.$$

Also from (25) for  $j = i_1$ , we get  $k_1 = \frac{c^{(i_1)} - b_0^{(i_1)}}{\beta_1^{(i_1)}}$ . Then we substitute this formula for  $k_1$  in (25) for all  $i_1 < j < i_2$  and obtain

$$(29) \quad c^{(j)} = b_0^{(j)} + \frac{c^{(i_1)} - b_0^{(i_1)}}{\beta_1^{(i_1)}} \beta_1^{(j)} \text{ for every } i_1 < j < i_2.$$

Then we express (26) for  $j = i_2$  as a linear congruence modulo  $\beta_2^{(i_2)}$  (also using the expression for  $k_1$  computed above). We obtain

$$(30) \quad c^{(i_2)} \equiv b_0^{(i_2)} + \frac{c^{(i_1)} - b_0^{(i_1)}}{\beta_1^{(i_1)}} \beta_1^{(i_2)} \pmod{\beta_2^{(i_2)}}.$$

Next we equate  $k_2$  from (26) for  $j = i_2$  (also using the formula for  $k_1$ ) and obtain

$$k_2 = \frac{c^{(i_2)} - b_0^{(i_2)} - \frac{c^{(i_1)} - b_0^{(i_1)}}{\beta_1^{(i_1)}} \beta_1^{(i_2)}}{\beta_2^{(i_2)}}$$

Then we substitute this formula for  $k_2$  in (26) for  $i_2 < j < i_3$  and obtain

$$(31) \quad c^{(j)} = b_0^{(j)} + \frac{c^{(i_1)} - b_0^{(i_1)}}{\beta_1^{(i_1)}} \cdot \beta_1^{(j)} + \frac{c^{(i_2)} - b_0^{(i_2)} - \frac{c^{(i_1)} - b_0^{(i_1)}}{\beta_1^{(i_1)}} \beta_1^{(i_2)}}{\beta_2^{(i_2)}} \cdot \beta_2^{(j)}.$$

We go on as above until we express  $c^{(m)}$  in terms of

$$c^{(i_1)}, \dots, c^{(i_n)}$$

and  $b_0^{(m)}$  and the  $\beta_j^{(l)}$ . We observe that all congruences can be written as linear congruences over  $\mathbb{Z}$ . For example, the above congruence equation (30) modulo  $\beta_2^{(i_2)}$  can be written as the following linear congruence over  $\mathbb{Z}$ :

$$\beta_1^{(i_1)} \cdot c^{(i_2)} \equiv \left( c^{(i_1)} - b_0^{(i_1)} \right) \beta_1^{(i_2)} + \beta_1^{(i_1)} b_0^{(i_2)} \left( \bmod \beta_1^{(i_1)} \cdot \beta_2^{(i_2)} \right).$$

Hence all the above conditions are either linear congruences or linear equations for the  $c^{(j)}$ .

A typical intersection point from the inner intersection in (20) corresponding to a tuple  $(n_1, \dots, n_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k$  is

$$\left( Q_0 + \sum_{i,j} z_{j,n_i} Q_i^{(j)} \right) \cap (U_h + \Gamma_1)$$

and it can be written in the following form (see also (13)):

$$\sum_{l=1}^g \left( a_0^{(l)} + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq k \\ 0 \leq j \leq g-1}} a_{i,j}^{(l)} \sum_{e=1}^g \gamma_{j,e} r_e^{n_i} \right) R_l.$$

Such a point lies in  $(U_h + \Gamma_1)$  if and only if its coefficients

$$a_0^{(l)} + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq k \\ 0 \leq j \leq g-1}} a_{i,j}^{(l)} \sum_{e=1}^g \gamma_{j,e} r_e^{n_i}$$

with respect to the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis  $\{R_1, \dots, R_m\}$  of  $M_1$  satisfy the linear congruences and linear equations such as (24), (28), (29), (30) and (31), associated to  $(U_h + \Gamma_1)$ . A linear equation as above yields an equation of the following form (after collecting the coefficients of  $r_e^{n_i}$  for each  $1 \leq e \leq g$  and each  $1 \leq i \leq k$ ):

$$(32) \quad \sum_{e=1}^g \sum_{i=1}^k d_{e,i} r_e^{n_i} = D.$$

All  $d_{e,i}$  and  $D$  are algebraic numbers. A tuple  $(n_1, \dots, n_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k$  satisfying (32) corresponds to an intersection point of the linear variety  $L$  in  $(\mathbb{G}_m^g)^k(\mathbb{Q}^{\text{alg}})$  given by the equation

$$(33) \quad \sum_{e=1}^g \sum_{i=1}^k d_{e,i} X_{e,i} = D$$

and the finitely generated subgroup  $G_0$  of  $(\mathbb{G}_m^g)^k(\mathbb{Q}^{\text{alg}})$  spanned by

$$(34) \quad (r_1, \dots, r_g, 1, \dots, 1); (1, \dots, 1, r_1, \dots, r_g, 1, \dots, 1); \dots, (1, \dots, 1, r_1, \dots, r_g).$$

Each vector in (34) has  $gk$  components. There are  $k$  multiplicatively independent generators above for  $G_0$  (we are using the fact that  $|r_i| > 1$ , for each  $i$ ). Hence  $G_0 \simeq \mathbb{Z}^k$ . By Lang Theorem for  $\mathbb{G}_m^{gk}$ , we conclude the intersection of  $L(\mathbb{Q}^{\text{alg}})$  and  $G_0$  is a finite union of cosets of subgroups of  $G_0$ . The subgroups of  $G_0$  correspond to subgroups of  $\mathbb{Z}^k$ . Hence the tuples  $(n_1, \dots, n_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k$  which satisfy (32) belong to a finite union of cosets of semigroups of  $\mathbb{N}^k$ .

A congruence equation as (28) or (30), corresponding to conditions for a point to lie in  $(U_h + \Gamma_1)$  yields a congruence relation between the coefficients (with respect to the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis

$\{R_1, \dots, R_m\}$  of  $M_1$ ) of a typical point of the form  $Q_0 + \sum_{j,i} z_{j,n_i} Q_i^{(j)}$ . We will show that such tuples  $(n_1, \dots, n_k)$  belong to a finite union of cosets of semigroups of  $\mathbb{N}^k$ .

The coefficient of  $R_l$  in  $\left(Q_0 + \sum_{j,i} z_{j,n_i} Q_i^{(j)}\right)$  can be written as (see also (15))

$$(35) \quad a_0^{(l)} + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq k \\ 0 \leq j \leq g-1}} a_{i,j}^{(l)} z_{j,n_i}.$$

Hence a congruence equation corresponding to a point of the form  $\left(Q_0 + \sum_{j,i} z_{j,n_i} Q_i^{(j)}\right)$  which also lies in  $(U_h + \Gamma_1)$  has the form

$$(36) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{g-1} \sum_{i=1}^k d_{j,i} z_{j,n_i} \equiv D_1 \pmod{D_2}$$

for some integers  $d_{j,i}$  (we recall that  $a_{i,j}^{(l)} \in \mathbb{Z}$ ),  $D_1$  and  $D_2 \neq 0$ . Recursively defined sequences as  $\{z_{j,n}\}_n$  are eventually periodic modulo any nonzero integer (hence, they are eventually periodic modulo  $D_2$ ). Therefore all the solutions  $(n_1, \dots, n_k)$  to (36) belong to a finite union of cosets of semigroups of  $\mathbb{N}^k$ .

Hence for each  $h \in M_{\text{tor}}$  the tuples  $(n_1, \dots, n_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k$  for which

$$\left(Q_0 + \sum_{i,j} z_{j,n_i} Q_i^{(j)}\right) \in (U_h + \Gamma_1),$$

form a finite union of cosets of semigroups of  $\mathbb{N}^k$ . We also proved that for each  $h \in M_{\text{tor}}$  the tuples  $(n_1, \dots, n_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k$  for which

$$h = T_0 + \sum_{i,j} z_{j,n_i} T_i^{(j)},$$

form a finite union of cosets of semigroups of  $\mathbb{N}^k$ . In conclusion, we get that

$$\left(Q + \sum_{i=1}^k F^{n_i} P_i\right) \in \Gamma$$

if and only if  $(n_1, \dots, n_k)$  belongs to a finite union of cosets of semigroups of  $\mathbb{N}^k$ . The corresponding subset of  $(Q + S(P_1, \dots, P_k; 1))$  for a finite union of cosets of semigroups of  $\mathbb{N}^k$  is precisely a finite union of groupless  $F$ -sets based in  $M$  (as shown by Lemma 3.4 of [3]).

This concludes the proof of Lemma 3.1  $\square$

As remarked before the statement of Lemma 3.1, this lemma concludes the proof of our Theorem 2.5.  $\square$

#### 4. THE MORDELL-LANG THEOREM FOR DRINFELD MODULES DEFINED OVER FINITE FIELDS

The setting for this section is that  $\phi : A \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q[F]$  is a Drinfeld module.

The following result (which is the equivalent for Drinfeld modules of Lemma 7.5 in [3]) will be used in the proof of our Theorem 2.7.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $K$  be a finitely generated field extension of  $\mathbb{F}_q$  and let  $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{G}_a^g(K)$  be a finitely generated  $A[F]$ -submodule.*

- (a) *The  $F$ -pure hull of  $\Gamma$  in  $\mathbb{G}_a^g(K)$ , i.e. the set of all  $x \in \mathbb{G}_a^g(K)$  such that  $F^m x \in \Gamma$  for some  $m \geq 0$ , is a finitely generated  $A$ -module. In particular,  $\Gamma$  is a finitely generated  $A$ -module.*
- (b) *For each  $m > 0$ ,  $\Gamma/F^m\Gamma$  is finite.*
- (c) *There exists  $m \geq 0$  such that  $\Gamma \setminus F\Gamma \subset \mathbb{G}_a^g(K) \setminus \mathbb{G}_a^g(K^{q^m})$ .*

*Proof.* (a) First we observe that the  $F$ -pure hull  $\tilde{\Gamma}$  of  $\Gamma$  is an  $A[F]$ -module, and so, implicitly an  $A$ -module. Indeed, if  $x \in \tilde{\Gamma}$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $F^m x \in \Gamma$ , then for every  $f \in A[F]$ ,

$$F^m(f(x)) = f(F^m x) \in f(\Gamma) \subset \Gamma.$$

Therefore  $f(x) \in \tilde{\Gamma}$ , showing that  $\tilde{\Gamma}$  is an  $A[F]$ -module.

It suffices to prove (a) under the extra assumption that  $\Gamma = \Gamma_0^g$  (the cartesian product of  $\Gamma_0$  with itself  $g$  times), where  $\Gamma_0 \subset K$  is a finitely generated  $A[F]$ -module. Indeed, let  $\Gamma_0$  be the finitely generated  $A[F]$ -submodule of  $K$  spanned by all the generators (over  $A[F]$ ) of the projections of  $\Gamma$  on the  $g$  coordinates of  $\mathbb{G}_a^g(K)$ . Clearly  $\Gamma \subset \Gamma_0^g$  and if we prove (a) for  $\Gamma_0$ , then the result of (a) holds also for  $\Gamma_0^g$  and implicitly for its submodule  $\Gamma$  (the  $F$ -pure hull of  $\Gamma$  is an  $A$ -submodule of the  $F$ -pure hull of  $\Gamma_0^g$  and a submodule of a finitely generated module over a Dedekind domain is also finitely generated). So, we are left to show that the  $F$ -pure hull  $\tilde{\Gamma}_0$  of  $\Gamma_0$  in  $K$  is a finitely generated  $A$ -module.

By its construction,  $\Gamma_0$  is a finitely generated  $A[F]$ -submodule of  $K$ . Because  $F$  is integral over  $A$ , we conclude  $\Gamma_0$  is also finitely generated as an  $A$ -module. As explained in the beginning of our proof,  $\tilde{\Gamma}_0$  is also an  $A$ -module. We first prove  $\tilde{\Gamma}_0$  lies inside the  $A$ -division hull  $\Gamma'_0$  of  $\Gamma_0$  in  $K$ . Indeed, let  $x \in \tilde{\Gamma}_0$  and let  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $F^m x \in \Gamma_0$ . We will prove next that  $x \in \Gamma'_0$ .

Because  $F$  is integral over  $A$ , then also  $F^m$  is integral over  $A$ . Let  $s \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and let  $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{s-1} \in A$  such that

$$(37) \quad F^{sm} = \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} \alpha_i F^{i \cdot m} \text{ in } \text{End}(\phi).$$

Because  $A[F]$  is a domain, we may assume  $\alpha_0 \neq 0$  (otherwise we would divide (37) by powers of  $F^m$  until the coefficient of  $F^0$  would be nonzero). Equality (37) shows that

$$(38) \quad \phi_{\alpha_0}(x) = F^{sm}x - \sum_{i=1}^{s-1} \phi_{\alpha_i}(F^{i \cdot m}x) \in \Gamma_0,$$

because  $F^m x \in \Gamma_0$  and  $\Gamma_0$  is an  $A[F]$ -module. Thus (38) shows  $x$  belongs to the  $A$ -division hull  $\Gamma'_0$ . Let  $F_0 := \text{Frac}(A)$ . Because  $\tilde{\Gamma}_0 \subset \Gamma'_0$  and because  $\Gamma_0$  is a finitely generated  $A$ -module, we conclude

$$(39) \quad \dim_{F_0} (\tilde{\Gamma}_0 \otimes_A F_0) \leq \dim_{F_0} (\Gamma'_0 \otimes_A F_0) < \aleph_0.$$

Hence (39) shows  $\tilde{\Gamma}_0$  has *finite rank* as an  $A$ -module. Lemma 4 of [5] shows that every finite rank  $A$ -module is finitely generated. This concludes the proof of (a).

(b) Because  $\Gamma$  is a finitely generated  $A[F]$ -module, then  $\Gamma/F^m\Gamma$  is a finitely generated  $A[F]/(F^m)$ -module. Hence, it suffices to show  $A[F]/(F^m)$  is a finite ring. Let, as before,

(37) be the minimal equation of  $F^m$  over  $A$ . Then  $\alpha_0 \in F^m \cdot A[F]$ . So,  $A[F]/(F^m)$  is a quotient of  $A[F]/(\alpha_0)$ . Clearly,  $A[F]/(\alpha_0) \simeq (A/(\alpha_0))[F]$ . Because  $\alpha_0 \neq 0$  and  $A$  is a Dedekind domain for which the residue field for each nonzero ideal is finite, we conclude  $A/(\alpha_0)$  is finite (we know that  $A/\mathfrak{p}$  is finite for every nonzero prime ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$ , but every nonzero ideal in  $A$  is a product of nonzero prime ideals). Because  $F$  is integral over  $A$  we conclude  $(A/(\alpha_0))[F]$  is finite. Hence  $A[F]/(F^m)$  is finite and so,  $\Gamma/F^m\Gamma$  is finite, as desired.

(c) Because the  $F$ -pure hull  $\tilde{\Gamma}$  of  $\Gamma$  in  $\mathbb{G}_a^g(K)$  is finitely generated as an  $A[F]$ -module, then there exists  $m_0 > 0$  such that  $F^{m_0}\tilde{\Gamma} \subset \Gamma$ . Let  $m := m_0 + 1$ . Then

$$\Gamma \cap \mathbb{G}_a^g(K^{q^m}) \subset F^m\tilde{\Gamma} \subset F\Gamma.$$

Hence  $\Gamma \setminus F\Gamma \subset \mathbb{G}_a^g(K) \setminus \mathbb{G}_a^g(K^{q^m})$ .  $\square$

We will also use in our proof of Theorem 2.7 the following result on the combinatorics of the  $F$ -sets.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Suppose  $K$  is a regular field extension of  $\mathbb{F}_q$ ,  $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{G}_a^g(K)$  is a finitely generated  $A[F]$ -module,  $X \subset \mathbb{G}_a^g$  is an affine variety defined over  $K$  and  $b \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . Clearly  $\Gamma$  is an  $A[F^b]$ -module as well. If  $U \subset \Gamma$  is an  $F^b$ -set with  $U \subset X(K)$ , then there exists  $V \in \mathsf{F}(\Gamma)$  such that  $U \subset V \subset X(K)$ . In particular, if  $X(K) \cap \Gamma$  is a finite union of  $F^b$ -sets, then it is also a finite union of  $F$ -sets.*

*Proof.* Our proof follows the proof of its similar statement for semiabelian varieties instead of Drinfeld modules and for  $\mathbb{Z}[F]$  instead of  $A[F]$  (Lemma 7.4 of [3]).

Let  $U = C + \Delta$ , where  $C$  is a groupless  $F^b$ -set and  $\Delta$  is a subgroup of  $\Gamma$  invariant under  $F^b$ . Let  $H$  be the Zariski closure of  $\Delta$  in  $\mathbb{G}_a^g$ . Then  $H$  is invariant under  $F^b$ . Hence  $H$  is defined over  $\mathbb{F}_{q^b}$  (which is the fixed field of  $F^b$ ). Because  $H$  is the Zariski closure of a subset of  $\mathbb{G}_a^g(K)$ , then  $H$  is defined over  $K$ . Therefore  $H$  is defined over  $K \cap \mathbb{F}_{q^b}$ . Because  $K$  is a regular extension of  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , then  $K \cap \mathbb{F}_{q^b} = \mathbb{F}_q$ . Thus  $H$  is defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  and so,  $H(K) \cap \Gamma$  is invariant under  $F$ .

Clearly every groupless  $F^b$ -set is also a groupless  $F$ -set and so,  $C$  is a groupless  $F$ -set. Therefore we conclude that  $V := C + H(K) \cap \Gamma$  is an  $F$ -set in  $\Gamma$ , which contains  $U$ . On the other hand,  $H \subset X$  (because  $\Delta \subset X(K)$  and  $H = \overline{\Delta}$ ). Moreover, for each  $c \in C$ ,

$$c + H(K) \cap \Gamma \subset \overline{c + \Delta}(K) \subset X(K).$$

Thus  $V \subset X(K)$ , as desired.  $\square$

The proof of the next two lemmas are identical with the proofs of Corollary 7.3 and respectively, Lemma 3.9 in [3].

**Lemma 4.3.** *Suppose  $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{G}_a^g(K)$  is a finitely generated  $A[F]$ -module,  $U$  is a finite union of  $F$ -sets in  $\Gamma$  and  $X \subset \mathbb{G}_a^g$  is an affine variety defined over  $K$ . Let  $\Sigma := \bigcup_{n \geq 0} F^n U$  and suppose that  $\Sigma \subset X(K)$ . Then there exists a finite union  $B$  of  $F$ -sets in  $\Gamma$  such that  $\Sigma \subset B \subset X(K)$ .*

**Lemma 4.4.** *Suppose  $M$  is a finitely generated  $A[F]$ -module.*

(a) *The intersection of two finite unions of  $F$ -sets in  $M$  is also a finite union of  $F$ -sets in  $M$ .*

(b) *If  $X$  is a finite union of  $F$ -sets in  $M$  and  $N$  is a submodule of  $M$ , then  $X \cap N$  is a finite union of  $F$ -sets in  $N$ .*

We will deduce Theorem 2.7 from the following slightly more general statement (our Theorem 2.7 is a particular case of Theorem 4.5 for  $H = \{0\}$ ).

**Theorem 4.5.** *Let  $K$  be a regular extension of  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . Let  $H$  be any algebraic subgroup of  $\mathbb{G}_a^g$  defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . Then for every variety  $X \subset \mathbb{G}_a^g/H$  defined over  $K$  and for every finitely generated  $A[F]$ -submodule  $\Gamma \subset (\mathbb{G}_a^g/H)(K)$ , the intersection  $X(K) \cap \Gamma$  is a finite union of  $F$ -sets in  $\Gamma$  based in  $(\mathbb{G}_a^g/H)(K^{\text{alg}})$ .*

*Proof.* We first observe that because  $H$  is an algebraic group defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , then  $H$  is invariant under  $A[F]$ . Hence, the quotient  $\mathbb{G}_a^g/H$  is equipped with a natural  $A$ -action.

Our proof follows the proof of Theorem 7.8 of [3]. Because  $\phi$  is defined over a finite field and because  $\Gamma$  is a finitely generated  $A$ -module (see (a) of Lemma 4.1) and because  $X$  is defined over a finitely generated field, then there exists a finitely generated subfield  $L$  of  $K$  such that  $X$  is defined over  $L$  and  $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{G}_a^g(L)$ . Therefore we may and do assume that  $K$  is finitely generated.

We will use induction on  $\dim(X)$ . If  $\dim(X) = 0$ , then  $X(K) \cap \Gamma$  is a finite collection of points. Clearly, each point is an  $F$ -set. We assume that Theorem 4.5 holds for  $\dim(X) < n$  (for some  $n \geq 1$ ) and we will prove that it also holds for  $\dim(X) = n$ .

We may assume  $\overline{X(K) \cap \Gamma} = X$  (otherwise, we may replace  $X$  with  $\overline{X(K) \cap \Gamma}$ ). Also, we may assume  $X$  is irreducible because it suffices to prove Theorem 4.5 for each irreducible component of  $X$  (we are using the fact that the intersection of  $X$  with  $\Gamma$  is Zariski dense if and only if the intersection of each irreducible component of  $X$  with  $\Gamma$  is Zariski dense in that component).

The next lemma shows that a translate of  $X$  is defined over a finite field. The proof of Lemma 4.6 is almost identical with the proof of Lemma 7.7 in [3]. Lemma 7.7 in [3] holds for any finitely generated subgroup of a semiabelian variety. In particular, it holds for any finitely generated  $\mathbb{Z}[F]$ -submodule of a semiabelian variety. The only difference between Lemma 7.7 in [3] and our Lemma 4.6 is that in [3],  $\Gamma$  can be taken to be a module over the Frobenius ring  $\mathbb{Z}[F]$  (associated to a semiabelian variety defined over a finite field), while in our case,  $\Gamma$  is a module over the Frobenius ring  $A[F]$  (associated to a Drinfeld module defined over a finite field). The only property of the Frobenius ring used in the proof of Lemma 7.7 in [3] is property (b) from Lemma 4.1 and the only property of the ambient algebraic group  $G$  (a semiabelian variety in [3] and  $\mathbb{G}_a^g/H$  for us) used in the proof of Lemma 7.7 in [3] is that  $\bigcap_{n \geq 1} F^n G(K^{\text{alg}}) = G(\mathbb{F}_q^{\text{alg}})$ .

**Lemma 4.6.** *Suppose  $\Gamma$  is a finitely generated  $A[F]$ -submodule of  $(\mathbb{G}_a^g/H)(K)$  and  $X \subset (\mathbb{G}_a^g/H)$  is a variety defined over  $K$  such that  $X(K) \cap \Gamma$  is Zariski dense in  $X$ . Then for some  $\gamma \in K^{\text{alg}}$ ,  $(\gamma + X)$  is defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q^{\text{alg}}$ .*

Next we show that we may assume  $X$  is defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . Lemma 4.6 shows that there exists  $\gamma \in K^{\text{alg}}$  such that  $(\gamma + X)$  is defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q^{\text{alg}}$ . Let  $\Gamma'$  be the finitely generated  $A[F]$ -module generated by  $\gamma$  and the elements of  $\Gamma$ . Let  $K' := K(\gamma)$ . Because  $X(K) \cap \Gamma$  is Zariski dense in  $X$ , then  $(\gamma + X) \cap \Gamma'$  is Zariski dense in  $(\gamma + X)$ . Hence  $(\gamma + X)$  is defined over  $K'$ . But we already know that  $(\gamma + X)$  is defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q^{\text{alg}}$ . Hence  $(\gamma + X)$  is defined over

$$\mathbb{F}_{q^b} := K' \cap \mathbb{F}_q^{\text{alg}}.$$

Assuming the statement of our Theorem 4.5 valid for varieties defined over the finite field fixed by the Frobenius, we obtain that  $(\gamma + X) \cap \Gamma'$  is an  $F^b$ -set. Because  $\Gamma$  is an  $A[F^b]$ -submodule of  $\Gamma'$ , we conclude

$$X(K) \cap \Gamma = X(K') \cap \Gamma = (X(K') \cap \Gamma') \cap \Gamma.$$

Hence, using part (b) of Lemma 4.4,  $X(K) \cap \Gamma$  is an  $F^b$ -set in  $\Gamma$ . An application of Lemma 4.2 concludes the proof that  $X(K) \cap \Gamma$  is indeed an  $F$ -set in  $\Gamma$ . Therefore, from now on, we assume that  $X$  is defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ .

We may also assume  $\text{Stab}(X) \subset \mathbb{G}_a^g/H$  is trivial. Indeed, let  $H_1 = \text{Stab}(X)$ . Then  $H_1$  is defined over the same field as  $X$ . Hence  $H_1$  is defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . We consider the canonical quotient map  $\pi : (\mathbb{G}_a^g/H) \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_a^g/(H + H_1)$ . Let  $\hat{X}$  and  $\hat{\Gamma}$  be the images of  $X$  and  $\Gamma$  through  $\pi$ . Clearly  $\text{Stab}(\hat{X}) = \{0\}$ . Moreover, if Theorem 4.5 holds for  $\hat{X}(K) \cap \hat{\Gamma}$ , then it also holds for  $X(K) \cap \Gamma = \pi|_{\Gamma}^{-1}(\hat{X}(K) \cap \hat{\Gamma})$  (we use the fact that  $\ker(\pi|_{\Gamma}) = \Gamma \cap H_1(K)$  is a subgroup of  $\Gamma$  invariant under  $F$ ). Also, it is precisely this part of our proof where we need the hypothesis of Theorem 4.5 be that  $X$  is a subvariety of a quotient of  $\mathbb{G}_a^g$  through an algebraic subgroup defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ .

From this point on the proof of Theorem 4.5 is identical with the proof of Theorem 7.8 in [3] (we provided in Lemmas 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 the technical ingredients that are used in the argument from the proof of Theorem 7.8 in [3]).  $\square$

The following result follows from Theorem 3.1 in [4] the same way our Theorem 2.7 followed from Theorem 7.8 in [3].

**Theorem 4.7.** *Let  $\phi : A \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q[F]$  be a Drinfeld module. Let  $F$  be the Frobenius on  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . Let  $K$  be an algebraically closed field extension of  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . Let  $X \subset \mathbb{G}_a^g$  (for some  $g \geq 1$ ) be an affine variety defined over  $K$ . Let  $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{G}_a^g(K)$  be a finitely generated  $A[F]$ -module. Let  $\Gamma' := \Gamma + \mathbb{G}_a^g(\mathbb{F}_q^{\text{alg}})$ . Then  $X(K) \cap \Gamma'$  is a finite union of sets of the form  $(U + Y(\mathbb{F}_q^{\text{alg}}))$ , where  $U \subset \Gamma'$  is an  $F^b$ -set for some  $b \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $Y \subset \mathbb{G}_a^g$  is an affine variety defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q^{\text{alg}}$ .*

In the following Example 4.8, we extend the notion of Drinfeld modules defined over finite fields and then we show that for our *new* Drinfeld modules, the groups appearing in the intersection from the conclusion of Theorem 2.7 are not necessarily  $A$ -modules (and hence, they are not  $A[F]$ -modules). This is in contrast with the semiabelian case where the groups appearing in the intersection  $X(K) \cap \Gamma$  are  $\mathbb{Z}[F]$ -modules.

**Example 4.8.** Let  $a \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . Let  $K$  be a regular extension of  $\mathbb{F}_{q^a}$ . Let  $\mathbb{F}_{q^a}\{F\}$  be the ring of twisted polynomials in  $F$  with coefficients in  $\mathbb{F}_{q^a}$  (the addition is the usual one, while the multiplication is the composition of functions). A Drinfeld module over a finite field is a ring homomorphism  $\phi : A \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_{q^a}\{F\}$  for which there exists  $a \in A$  such that  $\phi_a \notin \mathbb{F}_{q^a} \cdot F^0$ . Then  $F$  is not necessarily an endomorphism for  $\phi$ , but  $F^a \in \text{End}(\phi)$ . We want to characterize the intersections  $X(K) \cap \Gamma$ , where  $X \subset \mathbb{G}_a^g$  is an affine variety defined over  $K$  and  $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{G}_a^g(K)$  is a finitely generated  $A[F^a]$ -submodule.

We cannot always expect that the subgroups of  $\Gamma$  appearing in  $X(K) \cap \Gamma$  be actually  $A$ -submodules. For example, let  $C = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{F}_q}^1$  and let  $A = \mathbb{F}_q[t]$ . Let  $a = 2$ . Define  $\phi : A \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_{q^2}\{F\}$  by  $\phi_t = F + F^3$ . Let  $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_{q^2} \setminus \mathbb{F}_q$ . Consider the curve  $X \subset \mathbb{G}_a^2$  defined by  $y = \lambda x$ . Let  $K = \mathbb{F}_{q^2}(t)$  and let  $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{G}_a^2(K)$  be the cyclic  $A[F^2]$ -submodule generated by  $(t, \lambda t)$ .

Then  $X(K) \cap \Gamma$  consists of all points in  $\Gamma$  of the form  $(f(t), f(\lambda t))$ , where  $f \in A[F^2]$  is a polynomial in  $F^2$  with coefficients in  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . In particular,  $X(K) \cap \Gamma$  is invariant under  $\phi_{t^2} = F^2 + 2F^4 + F^6$ , but it is not invariant under  $\phi_t$ . So, the intersection is an  $\mathbb{F}_q[F^2]$ -submodule of  $\Gamma$ , but not an  $A[F^2]$ -submodule.

The following example shows that we cannot obtain a similar statement as our Theorem 2.5 in the context of Drinfeld modules, i.e. we cannot replace the  $A[F]$ -submodules  $\Gamma$  in Theorem 2.7 with simply  $A$ -modules.

**Example 4.9.** Assume  $q$  is odd and let  $A = \mathbb{F}_q[t]$ . Define  $\phi : A \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q[F]$  by  $\phi_t = F + F^2$ .

Let  $Y \subset \mathbb{G}_a^g$  be a smooth curve defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  and let  $K := \mathbb{F}_q(Y)$ . Let  $P \in Y(K)$  be a generic point for  $Y$ . Define  $X := \overline{Y + Y}$  and assume  $X$  does not contain translates of nontrivial algebraic subgroups of  $\mathbb{G}_a^g$  (for *generic* curves  $Y$  this is always possible). Let  $\tilde{\Gamma}$  be the  $A[F]$ -submodule of  $\mathbb{G}_a^g(K)$  generated by  $P$ . Then, using that  $X$  does not contain a translate of a nontrivial algebraic subgroup of  $\mathbb{G}_a^g$ , we conclude

$$(40) \quad X(K) \cap \tilde{\Gamma} = S(P, P; 1).$$

Let  $\Gamma$  be the cyclic  $A$ -module generated by  $P$ . Clearly,  $\Gamma \subset \tilde{\Gamma}$ . Hence, using (40), we obtain

$$X(K) \cap \Gamma = \bigcup_{n \geq 0} \phi_{t^{p^n}}(P) = \bigcup_{n \geq 0} (F^{p^n}P + F^{2p^n}P).$$

This is the case because the only elements  $a \in A$  such that  $\phi_a = F^n + F^m$  are of the form  $a = t^{p^n}$  (this is an easy exercise in combinatorics, whose proof we provide below for completeness).

**Lemma 4.10.** *Assume  $p$  is an odd prime and let  $q$  be a power of  $p$ . Let  $A := \mathbb{F}_q[t]$  and define the Drinfeld module  $\phi : A \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q[F]$  by  $\phi_t = F + F^2$ . Then the only elements  $a \in A$  such that  $\phi_a$  equals  $F^n + F^m$  for some  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$  are of the form  $a = t^{p^n}$  (in which case  $\phi_{t^{p^n}} = F^{p^n} + F^{2p^n}$ ).*

*Proof.* Let  $a = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i t^i \in A$  (hence  $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_q$ ). Assume  $\phi_a$  is the sum of two powers of  $F$ . We will prove that all  $a_i = 0$  for  $i < n$  and also that  $n$  is a power of  $p$ .

First we observe that if  $a_i = 0$  for all  $i < n$ , then  $a = a_n t^n$  and so, the expansion of  $(F + F^2)^n$  contains *only* two powers of  $F$  if and only if  $n$  is a power of  $p$  (Lucas Theorem for Binomial Congruences). Moreover,  $a_n = 1$  in order for  $\phi_a$  to be a sum of two powers of  $F$ .

Assume there is  $k < n$  such that  $a_k \neq 0$ . Let  $m$  be the least such  $k$ . Then the term  $a_m F^m$  has the smallest power of  $F$  which appears in  $\phi_a$  (and it is not cancelled by any other term in  $\phi_a$ ). On the other hand,  $a_n F^{2n}$  is the term in  $\phi_a$  with the largest power of  $F$  (and also it is not cancelled by any other term in  $\phi_a$ ). Therefore the only two powers of  $F$  in  $\phi_a$  are  $F^m$  and  $F^{2n}$ .

Let  $l$  be the index of the first nonzero digit in the expansion of  $n$  in base  $p$ , i.e.

$$n = \sum_{j \geq l} \alpha_j p^j$$

and  $\alpha_l \neq 0$ . Then the coefficient of  $F^{2n-p^l}$  in the expansion  $\phi_{a_n t^n}$  equals  $a_n \binom{n}{p^l} \neq 0$  in  $\mathbb{F}_q$  (by Lucas Theorem for Binomial Congruences). Moreover, also by Lucas Theorem, we get that

$F^{2n-p^l}$  is the largest power of  $F$ , not equal to  $F^{2n}$ , which appears with nonzero coefficient in the expansion of  $\phi_{a_n t^n}$ . Also,

$$2n - p^l \geq n > m.$$

Thus the power  $F^{2n-p^l}$  has to be cancelled by another term in  $\phi_a$ . Let  $n_1 < n$  be the largest index  $i$  such that  $a_i \neq 0$ . Then the largest power of  $F$  in  $\phi_{a-a_n t^n}$  is  $F^{2n_1}$  which does not cancel  $F^{2n-p^l}$ , because  $p^l$  is odd. Hence, either the power  $F^{2n-p^l}$  or the power  $F^{2n_1}$  appear with nonzero coefficients in  $\phi_a$ , contradicting thus the fact that the only powers of  $F$  in  $\phi_a$  are  $F^m$  and  $F^{2n}$ .  $\square$

*Remark 4.11.* The above proof works applied to the Drinfeld module  $\phi : \mathbb{F}_q[t] \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q[F]$  defined by  $\phi_t = F + F^3$ , in case  $p = 2$ , and shows that the only elements  $a \in A$  such that  $\phi_a$  equals  $F^n + F^m$  for some  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$  are of the form  $a = t^{2^n}$  (in which case  $\phi_{t^{2^n}} = F^{2^n} + F^{3 \cdot 2^n}$ ). This allows us to construct a similar example in characteristic 2 as Example 4.9 for the failure of a Mordell-Lang statement such as Theorem 2.7 for finitely generated  $A$ -modules  $\Gamma$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] D. Ghioca, *The Mordell-Lang Theorem for Drinfeld modules*. Internat. Math. Res. Notices, **53**, (2005), 3273-3307.
- [2] D. Goss, *Basic structures of function field arithmetic*. *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)]*, 35. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996.
- [3] R. Moosa, T. Scanlon, *F-structures and integral points on semiabelian varieties over finite fields*. Amer. Journal of Math., **126** (2004), 473-522.
- [4] R. Moosa, T. Scanlon, *The Mordell-Lang Conjecture in positive characteristic revisited*. Model Theory and Applications (eds. L. Bélair, P. D'Aquino, D. Marker, M. Otero, F. Point, & A. Wilkie), 2003, 273-296.
- [5] B. Poonen, *Local height functions and the Mordell-Weil theorem for Drinfeld modules*. Compositio Mathematica **97** (1995), 349-368.

DRAGOS GHIOCA, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS, HAMILTON HALL, ROOM 218, McMaster University, 1280 MAIN STREET WEST, HAMILTON, ONTARIO L8S 4K1, CANADA

*E-mail address:* dghioca@math.mcmaster.ca